

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|
| RAAJ AMEXEM MOOR RAFA EL | * | |
| Plaintiff | * | |
| v. | * | Civil Action No. JKB-11-3545 |
| STATE OF MARYLAND, INC., et al., | * | |
| Defendants | * | |
| | *** | |

MEMORANDUM

Plaintiff Raaj Amexem Moor Rafa El has sued the State of Maryland and Governor O’Malley seeking an “Emergency Petition for Immediate Peace/Protection/Restraining Order.” (ECF No. 1.) His complaint, touching in part on the same conduct complained of in *Rafa El v. State*, Civil Action No. JKB-11-2611, is nearly indecipherable. He seems to be complaining about being evicted from his apartment for nonpayment of rent after he had rejected the “Unlawful Status of a 14th Amendment U.S. Federal ‘Corporate’ BLACK citizen.” He takes issue with the Baltimore City sheriff’s deputies who evicted him, with the Baltimore Police Department for the actions of department members who, Rafa El alleges, kidnapped him and “brutalized” him, and with the District Court of Maryland for Baltimore City for unlawfully issuing “peace orders” against him. He further indicates that several cases under the Maryland Commercial Code have unlawfully been filed against him in state court. He seeks an order directing the State of Maryland, Governor Martin O’Malley, and Maryland State Treasurer Nancy Kopp to honor documents regarding monetary claims and “land reclamation” sent to them by Plaintiff. Rafa El has not paid a filing fee. He has filed an additional paper entitled, in part, “Motion to Proceed in Propria Persona” and says it should not be construed as a motion for leave

to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) since he is not a pauper. (ECF No. 2.) Notwithstanding the fact that the Plaintiff has failed to file any affidavit in support of the motion, nor has the motion been signed by Plaintiff, the motion shall be provisionally granted. The complaint has been reviewed and shall be summarily dismissed.

This Court may preliminarily review the claims in a plaintiff’s complaint and dismiss the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) prior to service if it is satisfied that it has no factual or legal basis and it is frivolous on its face. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989); *see also Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); *Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4th Cir. 1996). As explained by the Supreme Court in *Neitzke*: “[Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits]] are claims describing fanciful or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 328. Under these standards, the Court concludes Rafa El’s complaint is frivolous. Accordingly, the complaint will be dismissed by separate order.

DATED this 6th day of January, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

/s/
James K. Bredar
United States District Judge